VOL. XIX APRIL, 1942 No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS.

Editor: RIGHT REV. E. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.
St. Columba's College, Springwood.
Manager: REV. R. B. COUGHLAN.
St. Patrick's College, Manly.

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—Price: single copy, 3/6; yearly, *in advance,* 12/-; Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque (with exchange added).

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests have been appointed to act as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C. Record Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. W. J. Walsh, Opunake, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. B. Bolton, P.P., Kelvin Grove, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tasmania.
Diocese of Armidale—Rev. M. Tully, Adm., Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Auckland, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rev. J. P. Walsh, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. M. J. Dunne, Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. C. J. Collins, P.P., Forbury, N.Z.
Diocese of Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, Goulburn, N.S.W.
Diocese of Lismore—Very Rev. T. Morris, Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Very Rev. P. C. McCormack, P.P., Singleton, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. M. J. Dolan, Adm., Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Cowwarr, Vic.
Diocese of Sandhurst—
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. J. Madden, D.D., Toowoomba, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. P. Gahan, Coolamon, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—
Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. J. Halpin, S.T.L., Mt. Magnet, W.A.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS 65

A JUST WAGE AND THE BASIC WAGE
K. J. Wallace, Cip.Com., A.I.C.A. 79

SUGGESTIONS FOR RE-ORGANISED SECONDARY EDUCATION AFTER THE WAR
V. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D. 87

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW
Rt. Rev. J. J. Nevin, D.D., D.C.L. 96

The Legislation Incorporated in Can. 1098 Applies even to Marriages Contracted before the Civil Registrar or Non-Catholic Minister.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. J. Carroll, D.C.L. 106

Substitute for Olive Oil in Sanctuary Lamp. Genuflections to be made during Mass. Distributing Holy Communion at High Altar during Consecration at Side Altar. English Translation of Litany of Sacred Heart. Replacing Ciborium in Tabernacle while Mass is in Progress. Sermon during Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

CORRESPONDENCE 113

BOOK REVIEWS 115

The Bond of Perfection (Sr. Mary Agnes, S.N.D.), *The Things That Matter* (Rev. A. Roche), *Noble Castle* (Christopher Hollis).

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER,

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ NORMANNUS,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Official Documents

DISCOURSE OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS XII

to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Encyclical "Rerum novarum" on the Social Question—Feast of Pentecost, June 1st, 1941.

(Official Translation).

The feast of Pentecost, that glorious birthday of the Church of Christ, is to Our mind, dear children of the whole world, a welcome and auspicious occasion and one full of high import, on which to address to you, in the midst of the difficulties and strife of the present hour, a message of love, encouragement and comfort. We speak to you at a moment when every energy and force, physical and intellectual, of an ever-increasing section of mankind is being strained, to a degree and intensity never before known, beneath the iron, inexorable law of war; and when from other radio aerials are going forth words full of passion, bitterness, division and strife.

But the aerials of the Vatican Hill, of that ground dedicated to be the uncontaminated source of the Good Tidings and of their beneficent diffusion throughout the world from the place of martyrdom and tomb of the first Peter, can transmit only words animated with the consoling spirit of that preaching with which, on the first Pentecost Day, as it came from the lips of St. Peter, Jerusalem resounded and was stirred. It is a spirit of burning apostolic love, a spirit which is conscious of no more vivid desire, no holier joy than that of bringing all, friends and enemies, to the feet of the Crucified One of Calvary, to the tomb of the Glorified Son of God and Redeemer of the human race, to convince all that only in Him, and in the truth taught by Him, and in the love which He, doing good to all and healing all, taught by His example even to sacrificing Himself for the life of the world, can there be found true salvation and lasting happiness for individuals and for peoples.

In this hour pregnant with events which are known only to the divine counsels which rule the story of nations and watch over the Church, it is for us, beloved children, a source of sincere joy and gratification, in letting you hear the voice of your Common Father, to call you together, so to speak, in a world-wide Catholic meeting, so that you may experience and enjoy in the bond of peace that one *heart and one soul* (Acts 4, 32) which held together, under the impulse of the

Holy Ghost, the faithful of Jerusalem on Pentecost Day. As the circumstances created by the war make direct, living contact between the Supreme Pastor and his flock in many cases difficult, We greet with all the more gratitude this most expedite bridge which the inventive genius of our age throws across the ether in a flash, to unite across mountains, seas and continents every corner of the earth. And thus what for many is a weapon of war becomes for us a heavensent means of patient, peaceful apostolate which realises and gives new significance to the words of Holy Scripture: *Their sound hath gone forth unto all the earth; and their words unto the ends of the world* (Ps. 18, 5; Rom. 10, 18). Thus does it seem as if were renewed the miracle of Pentecost, when the different peoples who had assembled in Jerusalem from regions speaking various languages, heard the voice of Peter and the Apostles in their own tongue. With genuine delight We to-day make use of so wonderful an instrument, in order to call to the attention of the Catholic world a memory worthy of being written in letters of gold on the Calendar of the Church: the fiftieth anniversary of the publication, May 15, 1891, of the epoch-making social Encyclical of Leo XIII, the *Rerum novarum.*

It was in the profound conviction that the Church has not only the right but even the duty to make an authoritative pronouncement on the social question, that Leo XIII addressed his message to the world. He had no intention of laying down guiding principles on the purely practical, we might say technical side of the social structure; for he was well aware of the fact—as Our immediate Predecessor of saintly memory Pius XI pointed out ten years ago in his commemorative Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno*—that the Church does not claim such a mission. In the general framework of labour, to stimulate the sane and responsible development of all the energies, physical and spiritual, of individuals and their free organisation, there opens up a wide field of action where the public authority comes in with its integrating and coordinating activity exercised first through the local and professional corporations, and finally in the activity of the State itself, whose higher moderating social authority has the important duty of forestalling the dislocations of economic balance arising from plurality and diversity of clashing interests, individual and collective.

It is, on the other hand, the indisputable competence of the Church, on that side of the social order where it meets and enters into contact with the moral order, to decide whether the bases of a given social sys-

tem are in accord with the unchangeable order which God our Creator and Redeemer has shown us through the Natural Law and Revelation, that twofold manifestation to which Leo XIII appeals in his Encyclical. And with reason: for the dictates of the Natural Law and the truths of Revelation spring forth in a different manner, like two streams of water that do not flow against one another but together, from the same divine source; and the Church, guardian of the supernatural Christian order in which nature and grace converge, must form the consciences even of those who are called upon to find solutions for the problems and the duties imposed by social life. From the form given to Society, whether conforming or not to the divine law, depends and emerges the good and ill of souls, depends, that is, the decision whether men, all called to be revived by the grace of Christ, do actually in the detailed course of their life breathe the healthy vivifying atmosphere of truth and moral virtue or the disease-laden and often fatal air of error and corruption. Before such a thought and such an anticipation, how could the Church, loving Mother that she is, solicitous for the welfare of her children, remain an indifferent onlooker in their danger, remain silent and feign not to see or take cognisance of social conditions which, whether one wills it or not, make difficult or practically impossible a Christian life, in conformity with the precepts of the Divine Lawgiver?

Conscious of such a grave responsibility, Leo XIII, addressing his Encyclical to the world, pointed out to the conscience of Christians the errors and dangers of the materialist socialism conception, the fatal consequences of economic Liberalism so often unaware, or forgetful, or contemptuous of social duties; and exposed with masterly clarity and wonderful precision the principles that were suitable or necessary for improving—gradually and peacefully—the material and spiritual lot of the worker.

If, beloved children, you ask Us to-day, after fifty years from the date of publication of the Encyclical, to what extent the efficacy of its message corresponded to its noble intentions, to its thoughts so full of truth, to the beneficient directions understood and suggested by its wise author, We feel that We must answer thus: It is precisely to render to Almighty God from the bottom of Our heart, Our humble thanks for the gift which, fifty years ago He bestowed on the Church in that Encyclical of His Vicar on earth, and to praise Him for the lifegiving breath of the Spirit which through it, in ever growing measure from that time on, has blown on all mankind, that We on this feast of Pentecost, have decided to address you.

Our predecessor Pius XI has already exalted, in the first part of his commemorative Encyclical, the splendid crop of good to which the *Rerum novarum* like a fertile sowing had given rise. From it sprang forth a Catholic social teaching which gave to the children of the Church, priests and laymen, an orientation and method for social reconstruction which was overflowing with good effects; for through it there arose in the Catholic field numerous and diverse beneficent institutions that were flourishing centres of reciprocal help for themselves and others. What an amount of wellbeing, material and natural, what spiritual and supernatural profit has come to the workers and their families from the Catholic unions! How efficacious and suited to the need has been the help afforded by the Syndicates and Associations in favour of the agricultural and middle class to relieve their wants, defend them from injustice, and in this way, by soothing passion, to save social peace from disorder!

Nor was this the whole benefit. The Encyclical *Rerum novarum* coming down to the people and greeting them with esteem and love, went deep into the hearts and esteem of the working class, and inspired it with a sense of Christian sentiment and civil dignity; indeed its powerful influence came, with the passage of the years, to expand and spread to such an extent that its norms became almost the common property of all men. And, while the State in the nineteenth century, through excessive exaltation of liberty, considered as its exclusive scope the safeguarding of liberty by the law, Leo XIII admonished it that it had also the duty to interest itself in social welfare, taking care of the entire people and all its members, especially the weak and the dispossessed, through a generous social programme and the creation of a labour code. His call evoked a powerful response; and it is a clear duty of justice to recognise the progress which has been achieved in the lot of workers through the pains taken by the authorities in many lands. Hence was it well said that the *Rerum novarum* became the "Magna Charta" of Christian social endeavour.

Meanwhile there was passing a half century which has left deep furrows, and grievous disturbance in the domain of nations and society. The questions which social, and especially economic changes offered for moral consideration after the *Rerum novarum* have been treated with penetrating acumen by Our immediate Predecessor in the Encyclical *Quadragesimo anno*. The ten years which have followed it have been no less fraught in surprises in social and economic life than the years

before it, and have finally poured their dark and turbulent waters into the sea of a war, whose unforeseen currents may affect our economy and society.

What problems and what particular undertakings, some perhaps entirely novel, our social life will present to the care of the Church at the end of this conflict which sets so many peoples against one another, it is difficult for the moment to trace or foresee. If, however, the future has its roots in the past, if the experience of recent years is to be our guide for the future, We feel We may avail ourselves of this commemoration to give some further directive moral principles on three fundamental values of social and economic life; and We shall do this animated by the very spirit of Leo XIII and unfolding his views which were more than prophetic, presaging the social evolution of the day. These three fundamental values, which are closely connected one with the other, mutually complementary and independent, are: the use of material goods, labour and the family.

USE OF MATERIAL GOODS.

The Encyclical *Rerum novarum* expounds, on the question of property and man's sustenance, principles which have lost nothing of their inherent vigour with the passage of time, and to-day, fifty years after, strike their roots deeper and retain their innate vitality. In Our Encyclical *Sertum laetitiae,* directed to the bishops of the United States of America, We called the attention of all to the basic idea of these principles which consist, as We said, in the unquestionable need "that the goods which were created by God for all men, should flow equally to all, according to the principles of justice and charity."

Every man, as a living being gifted with reason, has in fact from nature the fundamental right to make use of the material goods of the earth, while it is left to the will of man and to the juridical statutes of nations to regulate in greater detail the actuation of this right. This individual right cannot in any way be suppressed, even by other clear and undisputed rights over material goods. Undoubtedly the natural order, deriving from God, demands also private property and the free reciprocal commerce of goods by interchange and gift, as well as the functioning of the State as a control over both these institutions. But all this remains subordinated to the natural scope of material goods, and cannot emancipate itself from the first and fundamental right which concedes their use to all men; but it should rather serve to make possible the actuation of this right in conformity with its scope. Only

thus can we and must we secure that private property and the use of material goods bring to society peace and prosperity and long life, that they no longer set up precarious conditions which will give rise to struggles and jealousies, and which are left to the blind interplay of force and weakness.

The native right to the use of material goods, intimately linked as it is with the dignity and other rights of the human person, together with the statutes mentioned above, provides man with a secure material basis of the highest import, on which to rise to the fulfilment, with reasonable liberty, of his moral duties. The safe guardianship of this right will ensure the personal dignity of man, and will facilitate for him the attention to and fulfilment of that sum of stable duties and decisions for which he is directly responsible to his Creator. Man has in truth the entirely personal duty to preserve and order to perfection his material and spiritual life, so as to secure the religious and moral scope which God has assigned to all men, and has given them as the supreme norm binding always and everywhere, before all other duties.

To safeguard the inviolable sphere of the rights of the human person and to facilitate the fulfilment of his duties should be the essential office of every public authority. Does not this flow from that genuine concept of the common good which the State is called upon to promote? Hence it follows that the care of such a *common good* does not imply a power so extensive over the members of the community that in virtue of it the public authority can interfere with the evolution of that individual activity which we have just described, decide directly on the beginning or—excepting the case of legitimate capital punishment—the ending of human life, determine at will the manner of his physical, spiritual, religious and moral movements in opposition to the personal duties or rights of man, and to this end abolish or deprive of efficacy his natural rights to material goods. To deduce such extension of power from the care of the common good would be equivalent to overthrowing the very meaning of the word common good, and falling into the error that the proper scope of man on earth is society, that society is an end in itself, that man has no other life which awaits him beyond that which ends here below.

Likewise the national economy, as it is the product of the men who work together in the community of the State has no other end than to secure without interruption the material conditions in which the individual life of the citizens may fully develop. Where this is secured

in a permanent way, a people will be, in a true sense, economically rich because of the general well-being, and consequently the personal right of all to the use of worldly goods is thus actuated in conformity with the purpose willed by the Creator.

From this, beloved children, it will be easy for you to conclude that the economic riches of a people do not properly consist in the abundance of goods measured according to a purely and solely material calculation of their worth, but in the fact that such an abundance represents and offers really and effectively the material basis sufficient for the proper personal development of its members. If such a just distribution of goods were not secured, or were effected only imperfectly, the real scope of national economy would not be attained; for, although there were at hand a lucky abundance of goods to dispose of, the people, in not being called upon to share them, would not be economically rich but poor. Suppose on the other hand that such a distribution is effected genuinely and permanently and you will see a people, even if it disposes of less goods, making itself economically sound.

These fundamental concepts regarding the riches and poverty of peoples, it seems to us particularly opportune to set before you to-day, when there is a tendency to judge such riches and poverty by balance sheets and by purely quantitative criteria of the need or the redundance of goods. If instead, the scope of the national economy is correctly considered, then it will become a guide for the efforts of statesmen and peoples, and will enlighten them to walk spontaneously along a way which does not call for continual exactions in goods and blood, but will give fruits of peace and general welfare.

LABOUR.

With the use of material goods you yourselves, dear children, see how labour is connected. The *Rerum novarum* teaches that there are two essential characteristics of human labour: it is personal and it is necessary. It is personal, because it is achieved through the exercise of man's particular forces; it is necessary, because without it one cannot secure what is indispensable to life; and man has a natural grave obligation to maintain life. To the personal duty to labour imposed by nature corresponds and follows the natural right of each individual to make of labour the means to provide for his own life and that of his children; so profoundly is the empire of nature ordained for the preservation of man.

But note that such a duty and the corresponding right to work is imposed on and conceded to the individual in the first instance by nature, and not by society, as if man were nothing more than a mere slave or official of the community. From that it follows that the duty and the right to organise the labour of the people belongs above all to the people immediately interested: the employers and the workers. If they do not fulfil their functions or cannot because of special extraordinary contingencies fulfil them, then it falls back on the State to intervene in the field of labour and in the division and distribution of work according to the form and measure that the common good properly understood demands.

In any case, every legitimate and beneficial interference of the State in the field of labour should be such as to safeguard and respect its personal character, both in the broad outlines and, as far as possible, in what concerns its execution; and this will happen, if the norms of the State do not abolish or render impossible the exercise of other rights and duties equally personal; such as the right to give God His due worship; the right to marry; the right of husband and wife, of father and mother to lead a married domestic life; the right to a reasonable liberty in the choice of a state of life and the fulfilment of a true vocation; a personal right, this last, if ever there was one, belonging to the spirit of man, and sublime when the higher imprescriptible rights of God and the Church meet, as in the choice and fulfilment of the priestly and religious vocations.

THE FAMILY.

According to the teaching of the *Rerum novarum,* nature itself has closely joined private property with the existence of human society and its true civilisation, and in a very special manner with the existence and development of the family. Such a link appears more than obvious. Should not private property secure for the father of a family the healthy liberty he needs in order to fulfil the duties assigned him by the Creator regarding the physical, spiritual and religious welfare of the family?

In the family the nation finds the natural and fecund roots of its greatness and power. If private property has to conduce to the good of the family, all public standards, and especially those of the State which regulate its possession, must not only make possible and preserve such a function—a function in the natural order under certain aspects, superior to all others—but must also perfect it ever more.

A so-called civil progress would, in fact, be unnatural, which—either through the excessive burdens imposed, or through exaggerated direct interference—were to render private property devoid of significance, practically taking from the family and its head the freedom to follow the scope set by God to the perfection of family life.

Of all the goods that can be the object of private property, none is more conformable to nature, according to the teaching of the *Rerum novarum*, than the land, the holding in which the family lives, and from the products of which it draws all or part of its subsistence. And it is in the spirit of the *Rerum novarum* to state that, as a rule, only that stability which is rooted in one's own holding, makes of the family the most vital and most perfect and fecund cell of society, joining up in a brilliant manner in its progressive cohesion the present and future generations. If to-day the concept and the creation of vital spaces is at the centre of social and political aims, should not one, before all else, think of the vital space of the family and free it of the fetters of conditions which do not permit even to formulate the idea of a homestead of one's own?

Our planet, with its extent of oceans and seas and lakes, with mountains and plains covered with eternal snows and ice, with great deserts and trackless lands is not, all the same, without habitable regions and vital spaces, now abandoned to wild natural vegetation, and well suited to be cultivated by man to satisfy his needs and civil activities; and more than once it is inevitable that some families, migrating from one spot or another, should go elsewhere in search of a new homeland. Then, according to the teaching of the *Rerum novarum* the right of the family to a vital space is recognised. When this happens, emigration attains its natural scope, as experience often shows; We mean the more favourable distribution of men on the earth's surface, suitable to colonies of agricultural workers; that surface which God created and prepared for the use of all. If the two parties, those who agree to leave their native land, and those who agree to admit the newcomers, remain anxious to eliminate as far as possible all obstacles to the birth and growth of real confidence between the country of emigration and that of immigration, all those affected by such a transference of people and places will profit by the transaction: the families will receive a plot of ground which will be native land for them in the true sense of the word: the thickly inhabited countries will be relieved, and their peoples will acquire new friends in foreign countries; and the states

which receive the emigrants will acquire industrious citizens. In this way the nations which give and those which receive will both contribute to the increased welfare of man and the progress of human culture.

These are the principles, concepts and norms, beloved children, with which We should wish even now to share in the future organisation of the new order which the world expects and hopes will arise from the seething ferment of the present struggle, to set the peoples at rest in peace and justice. What remains for us but, in the spirit of Leo XIII and in accordance with his advice and purpose, to exhort you to continue to promote the work which the last generation of your brothers and sisters has begun with such staunch courage? Do not let die in your midst and fade away the insistent call of the two Pontiffs of the social Encyclicals, that voice which indicates to the faithful in the supernatural regeneration of mankind the moral obligation to co-operate in the organisation of society, and especially of economic life, exhorting those who share in this life to action no less than the State itself. Is not this a sacred duty for every Christian? Do not let the external difficulties put you off, dear children; do not be upset by the growing paganism of public life. Do not let yourselves be misled by manufacturers of errors and unhealthy theories, those deplorable trends not of increase but of decomposition and of corruption of the religious life: currents of thought which hold that since the redemption belongs to the sphere of supernatural grace, and is therefore exclusively the work of God, there is no need for us to co-operate on earth. Oh, lamentable ignorance of the work of God! *Professing themselves to be wise they became fools* (Rom. 1, 22). As if the first efficacy of grace were not to co-operate with our sincere efforts to fulfil every day the commandments of God, as individuals and as members of society; as if for the last two thousand years there had not lived nor persevered in the soul of the Church the sense of the respective responsibility of all for all; so that souls were moved and are moved to heroic charity, the souls of the monks who cultivated the land, those who freed slaves, those who healed the sick, those who spread the faith, civilisation and science to all ages and all peoples, to create social conditions which alone are capable of making possible and feasible for all a life worthy of a man and of a Christian. But you who are conscious and convinced of this sacred responsibility, must not ever be satisfied with this widespread public mediocrity, in which the majority of men can not, except by heroic acts of virtue, observe the divine precepts which are always and in all cases inviolable.

If between the ideal and its realisation there appears even now an evident lack of proportion; if there have been failures, common indeed to all human activity; if divergencies of view arose on the way followed or to be followed, all this should not make you depressed or slow up your step or give rise to lamentations or recriminations; nor can it make you forget the consoling fact that the inspired message of the Pope of the *Rerum novarum* sent forth a living and clear stream of strong social sense, sincere and disinterested; a stream which if it be now partly perhaps covered by a landslide of divergent and overpowering events, to-morrow, when the ruin of this world hurricane is cleared, at the outset of that reconstruction of a new social order, which is a desire worthy of God and of man, will infuse new courage and a new wave of profusion and growth in the garden of human culture. Keep burning the noble flame of a brotherly social spirit which, fifty years ago, was rekindled in the hearts of your fathers by the luminous and illuminating torch of the words of Leo XIII; do not allow or permit it to lack for nourishment; let it flare up through your homage; and not die, quenched by an unworthy, timid, cautious inaction in face of the needs of the poor among our brethren, or overcome by the dust and dirt carried by the whirlwind of anti-Christian or non-Christian spirit. Nourish it, keep it alive, increase it; make this flame burn more brightly; carry it wherever a groan of suffering, a lament of misery, a cry of pain reaches you; feed it ever more with the heat of a love drawn from the Heart of your Redeemer, to which the month that now begins is consecrated. Go to that divine Heart meek and humble, refuge of all comfort in the fatigue and responsibility of the active life; it is the Heart of Him who to every act, genuine and pure, done in His name and in His spirit, in favour of the suffering, the hard-pressed, of those abandoned by the world, or those deprived of all goods and fortune, has promised the eternal reward of the blessed: you blessed of my Father! What you have done to the least of my brethren, you have done it to Me!

* * * *

SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL

INSTRUCTION

on exhorting the faithful to assist frequently and devoutly at the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

In view of the terrible weight of calamity which is pressing on the world, our Holy Father, Pius XII, has often called the Christian

people to prayer. With all the charity of his Apostolic heart His Holiness has frequently exhorted everybody to make fervent supplication for the present needs of human society, especially for the restoration of peace. He has also, in this regard, again and again recalled the promises of the Divine Master: "Ask and it shall be given to you, seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you" (Matt. vii, 7; Luke, xi, 9).

It was with this same intention that the Pontiff, through the Motu Proprio *Norunt profecto* of October 27, 1940, ordered Eucharistic sacrifices to be offered with special fervour everywhere. Indeed, "nothing is more efficacious to appease and propitiate the Divine Majesty than the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, wherein the Redeemer of the human race Himself *is sacrificed and offered in every place . . . as a clean oblation.* According to Catholic teaching, the Divine Sacrifice which is offered in the Mass and in which, as the Council of Trent declares, "that same Christ is contained and immolated without bloodshed, who offered Himself once with the shedding of His blood on the altar of the Cross" (Sess. xxii, chap. 2)—that Divine Sacrifice is, we say according to Catholic teaching, not only one of praise and thanksgiving, but is also really propitiatory both for the living and the dead.

Hence, throughout the ages, the Christian people never ceased to take every care that this clean oblation should be offered from the rising to the setting of the sun for their own needs as well as for the departed souls not yet fully cleansed. In the ages of faith the people have always been accustomed to practise frequent and devout assistance at Mass.

But, with the decline of faith and piety, it has come to pass, as everybody knows, that this old custom has lost its vigour. Many are so cold in their love for divine things that they neither appreciate the Sacrifice of the Mass as they ought, nor have it offered for themselves and for their dead as of old, and not rarely they are found turning to much less salutary practices.

On this account, the Sacred Congregation of the Council, by special command of the Holy Father, addresses a pressing exhortation to Ordinaries everywhere to direct their own efforts and the efforts of their clergy to the inculcation of the following points:

(1) The nature and excellence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, its ends and salutary fruits for the life of the world, its rites and ceremonies, so that the faithful may not be passive spectators only, but actively united in faith and charity with the celebrating priest;

(2) The grave obligation incumbent on all who have reached the use of reason to hear Mass on Sundays and Holy Days of precept, this sacrifice being the chief act of external and public worship due to God, whereby we acknowledge the supreme dominion over us of God our Creator, Redeemer and Preserver;

(3) The imperative and propitious efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Mass, a knowledge of which is eminently calculated to draw the faithful to frequent or (if possible) even daily assistance at Mass, since they will surely desire to give thanks to God, obtain benefits from Him, and expiate their own sins and those of the dead, mindful of St. Augustine's words: "I dare to assert that God, omnipotent though He is, could not give more, all-wise though He is, knew not how to give more, rich though He is, had nothing more to give" (tract. 84 in Joannem);

(4) The salutary participation in the heavenly banquet at each Mass as a means of closer union with Christ, according to the Decree given by this Sacred Congregation, December 20, 1905 (*De quotidiana SS. Eucharistiæ sumptione*) and the mind of the Council of Trent, expressed as follows: "The Sacred Synod would wish that at each Mass the faithful present should communicate not only spiritually by desire but sacramentally also, in view of more abundant participation in this holy Sacrifice—an effect promised in the words of Christ: I am the living bread come down from heaven. He who eats of this bread shall live for ever. He who eats me, the same shall live by me" (John, vi);

(5) The dogma of the communion of Saints, by virtue of which the Sacrifice of the Mass is abundantly applied, not only for the faithful departed expiating their human debts in piacular fire, but also for the living afflicted by so many anxieties and calamities and placed, particularly now, in such need of divine mercy and help.

To secure the better realisation of these aims, let the Ordinaries and others having the care of souls often recall the faithful to a genuinely Christian mode of life, to the avoidance of everything less becoming Christian faith and morals. Hence the need of disapproving immoderate expenditure prompted by vanity in the various occasions of life and entailing the omission of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is the chief means of suffrage and grace, and an infinite treasure of divine riches.

The Confraternities or Sodalities of the Blessed Sacrament required by Canon Law (Can. 711, 2) in each parish to further Eucharistic devotion, will prove a splendid auxiliary in the aforesaid programme.

Obedience and respect for these exhortations set forth by Bishops and clergy will, with the divine favour, make the faithful more appreciative of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, than which nothing can be more honourable or pleasing to God; and thus the Mass shall be for the whole world's salvation a fountain of life and holiness.

Given at Rome, July 14, 1941.

P. Card. MARMAGGI, *Prefect.*
J. BRUNO, *Secretary.*

A Just Wage and the Basic Wage

Summary:

1. History of Australian wage fixation.

2. (a) General principle determining just wage. (b) Considerations determining a just wage in practice.

3. (a) General principle governing the basic wage. (b) Method of fixation of basic wage in practice.

4. Comparison of the principles governing and method of determining a just wage and the basic wage.

As the great majority of men in modern society are propertyless, the determination of a just wage must be a social problem of much significance. In Australia our wage legislation revolves around the basic wage as determined by the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. This article attempts to outline the principle and method underlying basic wage fixation and to contrast these with the principle and method of determining a just wage as depicted by Catholic social teaching.

During the nineteeth century no attempt was made to fix a basic wage in Australia. Our industrial history began when the economic doctrine of laissez-faire was dominating the English social system. It was contended that any interference with the "natural laws" at the basis of the industrial system would be disastrous. Although Sir Samuel Griffith propounded the idea of a basic wage in 1890, his idea was not implemented until 1907. In that year the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration was required to determine whether the wages paid by a certan firm were "fair and reasonable." After some research Mr. Justice Higgins considered a fair wage for a family unit of five, a man, wife, and three children, was 7/- a day or £2/2/- a week. This determination is commonly called the Harvester award.

This award was never regarded as satisfactory because, as the Judge admitted, it was purely an empirical judgment, based on the evidence of a few housewives living in the Sunshine (Vic.) district. In 1912 the Commonwealth statistician published a series of index numbers, which revealed a big increase in the cost of living since 1907. This had two effects. First the basic wage was increased to 48/-, and, secondly, future wage rates, on the application of the unions, were to vary with changes in the cost of living index number. But this index number was not completely satisfactory, as it did not include clothing

in its regimen. Consequently when, during the Great War prices rose rapidly, real wages fell, despite an increase in money wages. Real wages are the amount of goods and services which money or nominal wages will purchase. This caused great discontent, and led to the appointment of a Royal Commission to determine a reasonable wage. It decided that £5/15/8 was reasonable, but it doubted the capacity of industry to pay that amount.

In 1921 quarterly automatic adjustments of the basic wage were introduced, replacing the idea of adjustments on application. But real wages still continued to lag behind price increases, and to bridge this gap the Powers 3/- was added to the basic wage in 1923. During the great depression a 10 per cent. reduction in real wages was made, a reduction which the unions unsuccessfully appealed against in 1932 and 1933. But at this latter appeal they succeeded in attaining a new and improved index number, which raised real wages by 2½ per cent.

The 10 per cent. reduction was restored in 1934 and, at the same time, the famous "C" or All-Items index number introduced. This index number differs from its predecessors as it includes clothing and miscellaneous household expenses, as well as food, rent, and groceries. To permit the workers to participate in the prosperity of industry and to prevent the advent of a depression, a prosperity "loading" was added to the basic wage in 1937. In 1940-1 the unions made an unsuccessful attempt to increase the wage rates, but the Federal Government, early in 1941, introduced a child endowment scheme, which provided for an allowance of 5/- per week for each child beyond the first, under 16 years of age.

PRINCIPLE DETERMINING JUST WAGE.

We now propose to consider the general principle specified by the Pope for the determination of a just wage. Before dealing with the question of a just wage, Pope Pius XI remarks that those "who hold the wage contract is essentially unjust are certainly in error." Both the Pope and Fr. Von Nell-Breuning speak of a "wage contract," not the "wage system." Probably they considered the use of the phrase "wage system" would lead to some people justifying the present system. Although the wage contract is not essentially unjust, this does not imply that a society in which the mass of men are wage earners is the best order. In fact, the Pope underlines the need of admitting as many workers to ownership as is possible.

What is the fundamental principle regulating a just wage? Von Nell-Breuning expounds it as follows:—"All depends on the determination of the value of the work done, because justice demands its compensation in equal values. The general principle of the equality of cause and effect, the principle of equivalence, holds true for wage justice too. The question therefore revolves around the necessity of determining the value of the work done. The Pope clearly, expressly and exclusively subjects the amount of wages to commutative justice." Thus Pope Pius XI writes in his encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno," "the mutual relations between capital and labour must be determined according to the law of strictest justice called commutative, supported by Christian charity."

Commutative justice, then, demands that the equivalence of a man's labour services be paid to him; but how is this equivalence to be determined in practice? In modern society the worker is usually dependent solely on his wages for the support of himself and his family. Therefore, right order ordains that the equivalence of his labour services should be sufficient for the support of himself and his family. If society be organised in a manner which makes the payment of a family wage impossible, social justice demands that it be re-ordered to permit the payment of such a wage. But granted such right order it is *commutative justice* which exacts from the individual employer the payment of a wage at least sufficient for the maintenance of the worker and his family. Two other important considerations to be assessed in determining the equivalence of his labour services are the common good and the state of the individual business. Hence a just wage may be more than a family wage: in a proper society it cannot be less.

Pope Pius XI does not limit the payment of a wage at least equal to a family wage to those who are married: he specifically says that "every adult working man" should receive this wage. This would seem to conflict with the method of fixing a family wage as suggested in "Justice Now," a pamphlet published by the National Secretariat of Catholic Action, and formally approved by the Episcopal Committee of Catholic Action. In this statement a basic wage for the single man is advocated, plus an allowance for his wife on marriage, plus an allowance for each child. The scheme would be financed by a fund created by the industry concerned and supplemented, if necessary, by the State.

This scheme seems to overlook the fact that it is commutative justice which determines the workers' wages. By commutative justice

a wage-earner is entitled to the exchange equivalence of the labour services he has rendered. To pay the unmarried worker less than the married man is to deprive the former of what is due to him by "strictest justice." Von Nell-Breuning examines the problem fully. He writes, "Compensation by family allowances will always be based on the wage rate of the unmarried worker, which is insufficient for the support of a family. Because it is believed impossible to provide all adult workers with wages sufficient for the support of a family, the wage rate of the unmarried worker is set lower, and the married man receives allowances. In this way the unmarried man receives less than the equivalent of the performed work. . . ."

If it be contended that our present economy is incapable of paying at least a family wage to all adult workers, then the argument is removed from the realm of principle to that of fact. And the answer given by the various experts will vary with the man and his philosophy, his attitude to the sacrosanct nature of profits and interest and his ideas of the present economy.

CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING WAGE FIXATION.

The family wage, however, is more than a minimum on which a family can subsist. Pope Leo considers it should be sufficient to tide a family over the usual periods of ill-health, and it should enable the worker to prepare for his old age. Moreover, both Pius XI and Leo XIII stress the need of workers acquiring some property. Pope Leo writes:—"If a workingman's wages be sufficient to enable him comfortably to support himself, his wife, and his children, he will find it easy, if he be a sensible man, to practise thrift; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by some little savings, and thus secure a modest source of income." And again he writes:—"the law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the people to become owners."

The second consideration governing the fixation of a just wage is the state of the business. "It is unjust to demand wages so high that an employer cannot pay them without ruin, and without consequent distress among working people themselves." (Pius XI). This consideration immediately raises two problems. First, the case of an employer who cannot pay a just wage because of his own inefficiency; and, secondly, the employer who cannot pay a just wage because of unfair competition or unjust burdens imposed on him.

Pope Pius specifically states that "if the business make smaller profit on account of bad management, want of enterprise, or out-of-date methods, this is not a just reason for reducing the workingman's wages." The second problem really involves a consideration of our commercial organisation. Many small firms are unable to pay a just wage because of the unfair competition of chain stores and large emporiums which, because of their size and organisation, are able to undercut the small businesses and force them to sell their goods at less than a just price. If this be true, social justice demands that the State intervene to correct the unjust social order. Again the modern idea that all loans are entitled to interest, irrespective of whether they are productive or not, leads in fact to the capitalist demanding his tribute even before the employer and his workers are paid a just wage. This applies particularly to many farmers, and is completely at variance with Catholic social teaching, which holds that the right of a worker to a just wage takes precedence over the right of a capitalist to his interest.

The third element to be considered in determining a just wage is the common good. "The wage scale must be regulated with a view to the economic welfare of the whole people." As if to explain the meaning of this the Pope writes:—"All are aware that a scale of wages too low, no less than a scale excessively high, causes unemployment." One of the major causes of most depressions is the mal-distribution of income in society. Too little goes to the worker as wages; too much accrues to the capitalist as interest and profits. The result is over-investment in capital goods and under-investment in consumer goods. This causes overproduction or, if you prefer it, underconsumption, leading to a depression.

PRINCIPLE DETERMINING BASIC WAGE.

We have described the principle and method of determining a just wage according to Catholic social teaching. What is the principle guiding the Arbirtration Court when it fixes a basic wage? The first was that enunciated by Mr. Justice Higgins in the Harvester award of 1907. He decided that the basic wage should be sufficient for "the normal needs of an average employee regarded as a human being living in a civilised community." The normal needs of an average employee were taken to include the needs of a wife and three children. That principle was abandoned in 1934. In its place was adopted the principle that the basic wage should be the highest the country can afford to pay.

According to both of these principles commutative justice has nothing to do with the assessment of the basic wage. There is no idea of granting the worker the equivalent of the work performed. As Mr. Foenander, Lecturer at the University of Melbourne, explained, "the wage has no relation with the services rendered by the recipient.' The Harvester principle did correspond in theory, though not in fact, with the Pope's idea of a family wage. The replacement of that principle by one based solely on the capacity of industry to pay is a retrograde step. The importance of that step can best be gauged by quoting from a statement made by Judge Piper when arbitrating on the basic wage case in 1941. "There appeared to be an erroneous impression in some quarters that the guiding principle on which the basic wage was now fixed was that it was to be a family wage. . . . The dominant factor in fixing the basic wage was the economic or productivity factor, and the basic wage must be the highest that industry as a whole can pay. The needs of a family were only a guide in determining that wage, and were not an absolute guide, and the court had not enunciated its own standards either as to the needs or the size of the family to be provided for."

BASIC WAGE FIXATION.

Having considered the general principle behind basic wage fixation, it now remains to review the method of its determination. There are four aspects of wage fixation to be considered.

1. The basic wage proper is divided into two—the needs section and the prosperity loading. The needs section is determined for the unskilled wage earner. It should be a living wage, and the court is guided in its fixation by the capacity of industry to pay. It is the minimum but not the maximum a worker can be paid.

In 1937 a loading was added to the needs element. It was known as a prosperity loading, and permitted the workers to share in the prosperity industry was enjoying. Thus the principle of "the capacity of industry to pay" was implemented in practice. This loading was added mainly because of the evidence of Mr. Reddaway, an English economist, who showed that its effect would be to prevent a depression resulting from an undue investment in capital goods. It may be noted that the loading involves a consideration of the common good, and agrees with the Pope's teaching in his encyclical.

2. The needs section of the basic wage is retained at its 1934 level by the use of index numbers. An index number is a statistical

device designed to reflect changes in the general price level. Rising prices would deprive the workers of the benefit of this needs element, and to prevent this it is varied with movements in the cost of living index number.

3. Thirdly, we have the secondary wage. It is a margin over and above the basic wage, paid to skilled workers because of special training, responsibility or experience. Quite distinct from the margins paid to unskilled workers because of the disagreeable nature of their work, it varies within and between industries. In assessing it the Court generally considers the nature of the service plus the capacity of industry to pay. These margins do not vary with changes in the cost of living, and have no fixed relationship with the basic wage. To-day they vary within 4 and 40 per cent. of that wage.

4. The basic wage is to be as nearly as possible equal for all workers who receive it, irrespective of their place of employment. This involves a calculation of different rates for the various cities in order to equate the real wages obtained. Consequently there is no such thing as a single national basic wage.

Although not an integral part of the basic wage system, it may be well to note the child endowment scheme. The endowment allowance is a confession of the inadequacy of the present basic wage for the support of a decent family, and it attempts to remedy that deficiency.

JUST WAGE v. BASIC WAGE.

It now remains to compare the State's idea of a basic wage with the Pope's idea of a just wage. We have seen that the determining principle is the ability of industry to pay and that this principle conflicts with the ideas expressed in the encyclical. The use of the term "basic" can be criticised. Basic may imply a minimum on which a worker can subsist, and thus conflict with the Pope's idea of a just wage. In fact the Chief Justice admitted in the 1941 enquiry that the present wage was only adequate for a man, wife and one child. "On our accepted standards of living, looking at it from the needs point of view only, I regard the present basic wage as adequate for a family unit of three, but think it offers only a meagre existence for a family unit of four. When the unit gets beyond four, hardship is often experienced. During portion of his term as a low-wage employee, a married man frequently has a family of more than two dependent children." The child endowment scheme, to some extent,

ovrcomes this criticism. But this scheme is only a second best. As Fr. Von Nell-Breuning writes:—"the certainly beneficial influence of family allotments, and the institutions created for them, must not let us forget the fact that they are merely makeshifts, crutches rendering valuable service as long as we are unable to walk without them."

The second criticism is that no provision is made for periods of ill-health. In the cost of living index number guiding the Court some provision is made for lodge fees, medicine, etc., but the allowance is inadequate.

Thirdly, no attempt is made to enable the workers to become property owners, an aim which both Popes supported strongly.

Fourthly, the cost of living index number is deficient in some respects. Some important items are omitted altogether, e.g., vegetables; others are included in insufficient quantities, e.g., tobacco.

The basic wage is insufficient to provide for a decent family. How far does it conflict or agree with the other two major considerations outlined by the Pope? The state of the individual business has nothing to do with the wage fixed. A uniform wage is imposed on all industry, and the individual firms make little attempt to increase the rates, even if they be well able to pay a just wage. The only feasible means of attaining this end is by the establishment of a vocational order. Under the present order the mnimum fixed becomes the maximum paid.

The general principle of the capacity of industry to pay implies a consideration of the common good. We have seen that the prosperity loading of 1937 was specifically imposed for the general welfare of society. Again during the depression the 10 per cent. reduction in real wages was an attempt to restore industrial stability.

No analysis is made in this article of female and junior wage rates. A treatment of female wages would raise problems; for example, equal pay for equal work, which would threaten to extend the length of the essay indefinitely.

We can say, then, that the principles governing and the method of fixing the Australian basic wage differ greatly from the Catholic idea of a just wage.

K. J. WALLACE,
Dip.Com., A.I.C.A.

Suggestions for Re-organized Secondary Education after the War

(V. REV. J. T. McMAHON, M.A., Ph.D.).

"I am told on every hand that the American school system does not educate: that it only smears the courses on to the man. They emerge like luggage after a well-planned tour covered with the labels, but with very little acquirement within. The producct of the schools is a superior class of the unfitted. They are capable of striking out for themselves.

They have followed a formula rather than a gleam. The science of education is overdone. Professors teach the art of teaching until there will soon be a chair for teaching teachers how to teach teaching. A name in athletics will dispose an employer more than a Ph.D.

The colleges give a stamp of assurance to young men, this is especially so with those who are admitted into the Fraternities denominated by Greek letters which correspond to the old School Ties in England.

Most colleges are approached through an office displaying the sign INFORMATION. This is perhaps modest, for most of them have the right to signal KNOWLEDGE.—Shane Leslie in *American Wonderland*, p. 182.

How much of that criticism applies to us?

Let us begin with the training of teachers.

In U.S.A. the position of secondary school teachers is this:—

Women Teachers: The staffing of American High Schools is in a state of flux. Men do not accept is as a final career.

Because, (1) there is not enough money in it; (2) it has little standing; (3) post-graduate courses leading to Ph.D. are so accessible and so cheap that most men seek them; (4) with a Ph.D. in some speciality there is almost a certain chance of a lectureship at a University, v.g., at my University of Washington there were 10 professors of Education, with many lecturers.

The High Schools are slowly but increasingly being staffed by women, and the War will accentuate that condition. Women accept the position as a convenient halting place before marriage. I confess I did not feel happy attending a large High School in New York,

where women teachers were in charge of mixed classes. Some of the boys looked mature enough to pop the question to teacher.

A mixed class of youth from 12 to 17 is not the most successful atmosphere for serious study. There are too many emotional disturbances, especially with Miss America of sweet 16, who seems manicured all over.

Every American boy or girl demands as a natural right a full High School, and most of them a four years' course leading to a College degree.

System of Credits: There are no external examinations for American High Schools. A pupil satisfies his masters, and fulfils the requirements of hours in class, which are called credits, and so he emerges. How do credits work? On the whole, badly. Pupils can get through on a physical endurance test.

What would I like to happen after the War?

1. A University Degree for all secondary school teachers.
   Encourage them to take a special group, v.g.
   Classics,
   Or Modern Languages,
   Or Mathematics,
   Or Science,
   Aim at Scholarship in the selected subjects, with the hope of advancing to a major degree later.
   cf. The French system.
   Secondary school teachers become notable scholars of some branch, which eventually leads them to a University. Teaching is high in French Universities because the occupants of the Chair were once actual teachers. I think all University graduates will agree that the Universities here are not remarkable for the teaching ability of their faculties.

2. A Diploma in teaching is necessary. I would require at least one year's full time teaching after the degree before anyone could enrol in the Diploma course.

3. On receiving a diploma, and on every additional degree the teacher should receive an increase in salary. That financial recognition of industry among teachers has proved a fine incentive in some countries, v.g., in the British Isles, in Ireland, and in South Africa.

4. After 5 years' teaching there should be a refresher course at the Universty, covering a whole year. Teachers should receive their normal salary, and be granted leave to do this course. I would make such a course compulsory for all secondary school teachers within ten years after their first degree. The vacation refresher courses are not fair to hard-working teachers or University people. Both need a break each year. But the fruit of such a year would be rich indeed.

Who would conduct such a year's studies?

(a) The aim would be to refurbish the essential instruments of teaching. I would hand the opening term over to the Education faculty to do that necessary overhaul.

(b) In the second term I would seek people in schools who have won a reputation as enthusiastic teachers of some subject. Bring those before such a body, and set them the task of inspiring them with a like enthusiasm. We have some remarkable teachers in our midst, and it is a pity we do not give them an opportunity to light the candles of inspiration and enthusiasm in the hearts of their fellow-workers.

(c) In the third term I would set the ideal of teaching to think in every subject. I would harness every means that would send such a body upwards towards that ideal. Every device would be used to limber up their imagination, v.g., observation of work done in any high school; a demonstration followed by a critical discussion.

(d) Originality has been defined as a pair of fresh eyes. In the spirit of a game, every part of a subject would be submitted to this question: Does it *have* to be taught that way?

Can we look at it through the eyes of the pupil,
or the parent, or an employer?"

I would have one lecture period each week in the third term devoted to playing the same of "supposing," as a means of releasing the mind from conventional stays. Clear away the dust of practicality, and remove the hoary hand of classroom tradition, and give the imagination free rein. Go back to childhood's sheer joy in letting our fancy run riot while playing with ideas.

Let us follow the example of a group of New York business executives who twice a week at lunch play the game of "supposing,"

by posing any outlandish question that may come to them: for example: "Suppose taxes were raised 5 per cent., how could we pay them without raising prices or lowering wages?"; or "Suppose we all went blind, how should we carry on the business?" Each member of the group must propose an answer, and so give his imagination a chance. Never mind how silly the answers are. With practice they will improve.

Another valuable principle to apply in the exercise of imagination is to put yourself in another's place, and ask what you would do. If there is someone I try to avoid, I am "to act as if" I liked him, and immediately relations between us are improving. A selfish man is "to act as if" he were generous, and less selfish will he grow. This principle with a will to win must accomplish great things in the building up of character to meet the problems of the adolescent boy and girl.

Dale Carnegie in his best seller: *"How to Win Friends and Influence the People,"* has a lot of sound horse-sense in many of his recommendations, few of which are original, but all of which are served appetisingly in an anecdotal dressing. He quotes Abe Lincoln as saying: "Most folks are about as happy as they make up their minds to be." Everything depends on the current of our thoughts. To think rightly is to create.

Business executives in this state have assured me that a happier working atmosphere has resulted from the circulation of this book among their staff. And, of course, as a natural consequence, sales have been better.

This magic door of imagination tends to jam through the din and monotony of class following class, day after day, in rain and in shine, in good form and in depressing mood. The psychologists assure us that in tests for general intelligence the middle-placed officials run neck and neck with the higher executives, but when imagination was tested the highly-placed men shot ahead. They also assure us that creative imagination is not a special possession of genius. All of us possess imagination, but we do not make it work for us. Were we to use it we should cross over from half-success to success, from a passable life to one happy in its achievement, from the dead level of mediocrities into the rare enjoyment of the enthusiasts.

RE-ORGANIZATION FROM PUPIL'S POINT OF VIEW.

Junior Leaving:

I would let the Junior Leaving Examination stand as it is. It has a market value that puts all pupils on an equal footing when applying for a position. Were it discontinued the pupils at some schools would have a decided advantage over others.

Senior Leaving:

I do not think that the present Leaving course considers the pupils. The Leaving certificate aims at entrance to the University, and its studies are directed to that end, even though very many pupils have no intention of going on with academic education.

During the years, two or three, between Junior and Leaving, I would like to see, at least, four choices offered to pupils.

1*st Course*—Those intending to enter the University must do the subjects prescribed as essential by the University. The course would remain as it is. The University should have the final say on what subjects its future students of medicine, law, arts, science or engineering should follow.

2nd Course—This would cater for boys who did not intend to pursue a University education. It would be much less bookish than at present. A large assignment to the doing-hand would teach boys to think, through making things, planning projects, visits to factories, and contacts with men prominent in civic, commercial, and industrial life.

Education for leisure would receive much time and attention. All types would be catered for. Unfortunately, the apostles of education for leisure, Aristotle and Newman, thought only of the bookish mentality. The boys interested in books can be easily prepared to select what to read, how to read, and how to discuss what they have read. The other boys not so inclined must be prepared to take up a hobby. The use of leisure is one of our most serious problems as educators. Everyone enjoys to-day many hours after work. How does he use them Shall he sink to mere amusement, or will he live a full life by devoting his non-working hours to some creative hobby? Can we make the social hours of life rich and meaningful for the masses? The aim of educating for leisure is to arm a man against loneliness by providing him with a hobby that must bring happiness and self-satisfaction into his idle hours. How eagerly a man faces home who has a garden enthusiasm, or a carpenter's bench, or an

easel with a box of paints, or a dramatic rehearsal, or an article to write, or a collector's corner in his house, or a youth-group to lead, or an Old Boys' organization to nurse and foster, or any one of the innumerable hobbies of the doing hand!

These activities lead to reflection, and self-questioning. They make a man contented with his own company. They lead him through that happy portal of achievement over which we might inscribe those words of Newman: "He has the repose of mind which lives in itself while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public, and supports him in retirement, without which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm."

3rd Course—I would like to see the country High Schools aim at educating its youth to remain on the land. At present they are enticing the sons of farmers away from the land, because their studies mainly lead to the profession of teaching. A strong bias to agricultural science, and an introduction to the philosophy of health and contentment which the land bestows on all who serve her, should dominate the teaching of this course. Our country High Schools have done little to dam the flow of farmers' sons into the city.

The mentality of the teachers in our country High Schools is not helpful. They fret to get to the city, and their pupils catch that mood from them.

I would like to see our country High Schools follow the lead of the people's High Schools of Denmark. Denmark owes its supreme position as the dairy farmer of Europe and the British Isles to these schools. From the ages of 18 to 25 the Danish people return to a boarding school for an adult education course. Denmark, like Australia, farms for export. Denmark is a land poor in mineral wealth. Their only hope was to specialize as the providers of the breakfast tables of Europe.

In Denmark education is compulsory up to the age of 15. From 15 to 18 boys and girls return to work on farms, unlike European conditions, which continue tecchnical education immediately following the ordinary schooling. The people's High Schools offer two courses—

1. A highly specialized agricultural school course is offered con-

tinuously in 35 centres: some 7000 young farmers, men and women, attend these annually.

2. Special craft schools of instruction and practice in making all things for a farmer's home. The schools have a holiday-camp atmosphere. There is plenty of music, Danish folk-dancing, and many happy marriages are the result.

The schools are organized apart from the state. All who attend from six weeks to six months pay small fees. Large bequests supply many free places. A whole village and neighbourhood organizes a general exodus of its farmers to some special centre. This local organization adds to the popularity of the schools throughout the country. In a carnival mood they take up residence for their courses.

The schools work on the principle that the farmer and her workers are ready for the best formation between the years 18 to 25. With three years of work on a farm they are conscious of the practical needs of a farmer. This continuation schooling opens their minds to the place of Denmark in international trade. Home industries are few, and the only market open to them is the dining tables of Europe. Without this specialized training they could never hold that market.

Denmark believes that its people's High Schools are the chief instrument in its national progress.

Why cannot we use the country High Schools to bring back the sons and daughters of farmers in the neighbourhood to such courses that will make them more efficient farmers and more contented dwellers on the land? Among all classes of society, the farmer especially may hold himself to have been honoured by Christ. Beginning His beautiful parable of the vine and the branches, He calls His Father in simple words a farmer: "My Father is a farmer." His teachings abound with illustrations taken from farm life. He compares His Kingdom to a vineyard. Again He compares it to a sheepfold, of which He Himself is the good Shepherd.

4th Course—A full programme of domestic economy for girls. A large part would be devoted to the art of listening to music, the dramatic art, and other artistic home-enriching activities. Most girls ambition marriage, and the apprenticeship of an office stool has not proved the best preparation for a successful home-maker.

The Examinations for the Leaving certificate would adapt themselves to these four courses.

A CHANGE OF ATTITUDES WITHIN THE CLASS-ROOMS.

The Ideal:

Teaching to think is the best preparation for life that we can give our youth. Ideas lead to action. All effective thinking is creative in the sense that it is not a mere repetition of something learned. Thinking makes us self-starters.

A general critisicm of our post-primary class-work is that it is too passive. The pupils are too long at the listening end. The passive reception of ideas leaves no mark on the mind. It is only when the mind makes those new ideas subjectively its own through mental digestion that any enlargement is said to follow. We feel our minds to be growing and expanding then, when we not only learn, but refer what we learn to what we know already. It is not a mere addition to our knowledge which illuminates and enlightens the mind. No, it is the mind's action upon those incoming ideas which makes them personally acceptable and formative.

What suggestions would I offer to change passivity into activity within our class-rooms?

The Means:

(1) I would reduce the time of a teacher's talking by the formation of groups within the class. These groups would be set an assignment that should make them a study circle.

(2) I would encourage pupils' contributions by lecturettes, giving the class freedom to ask questions and to heckle the speaker during the lecture. This discussion atmosphere is an essential training to think on their feet.

(3) By setting projects before the class I would provide activities other than bookish. The very best means of understanding is to perform. The trained hand encourages thought.

(4) Dominating all this is the attitude of the teacher, whom I may define as one who stimulates the self-activity of the child, or one who causes knowledge in another.

We speak of the personality of the teacher, the spirit he creates, the inspiration he gives, the enthusiasm he communicates. And that means more in education than method or technique.

A scene in the New Testament has a message for the teacher who teaches his pupils to think. To the banks of the Jordan flocked thousands to see and hear John the Baptist. They were ready to hail him

as the promised Messiah, and many there were who resented the appearance of Christ of Nazareth, for John gradually left the stage for Him. They remonstrated with John, and he replied, "That He may increase I must diminish." All teachers should think over those words. We must curb the desire in us to hear ourselves talking. We must wait patiently, and not rush to do for the child what he will do best for himself through his own limping efforts.

Sir John Adams hails this attitude with delight. He writes: "Curiously enough the first results of the spread of self-examination among teachers is a certain doubt about the need for the present amount of teaching. There is an uneasy feeling among the more thoughtful members of our craft that perhaps we are teaching too much. It is beginning to be realized in schools that we are obsessed with the conviction that nothing of itself will come, and we must still be teaching. . . . . Accordingly it is a hopeful sign to hear teachers speak favourably of 'wholesome neglect.' What is really wanted is a better manipulation of the incidence of teaching.

In particular, the relative activities of teachers and pupils have to be revised. In the new teaching it is recognised that the pupil must play a more vigorous part than in the old."

Moral Theology and Canon Law

THE LEGISLATION INCORPORATED IN CAN. 1098 APPLIES EVEN TO MARRIAGES CONTRACTED BEFORE THE CIVIL REGISTRAR OR NON-CATHOLIC MINISTER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I am submitting two cases which I beg you to read carefully, and give us your opinion on them through the medium of the *A.C. Record*. Such cases are not infrequent in this diocese.

That you may appreciate fully the actual state of things, I would have you know that the area of the parish concerned extends along the coast to a distance of eight hundred miles. and, inland, to a depth of about two hundred miles. In the past, a priest travelled up the coast once or twice a year. Now, the priest in charge is constantly moving about through those vast regions, visiting most towns about twice a year and stations once a year.

Case I. Bertha, a Catholic, is the child of a mixed marriage. Her parents lived in the city, but, for some reason, she was staying with Protestant relations who owned the hotel in a small coastal town. Here, she became engaged to Titius, an Anglican. Her relations found it necessary to move, and Bertha and Titius decided to marry. There was no priest available, and Bertha refused to be married either in the Protestant church or in the Registry. Eventually, they were married privately by the Protestant Minister in the hotel. When the priest was on his round, he approached Titius concerning the catholic education of the children. Titius refused to make any promises on the point, but merely replied that, in all probability, they would follow the wife's religion. Bertha now wants to go to the Sacraments. I ask: (a) Was the marriage valid in the circumstances?; (b) Were any censures incurred,; (c) Must Titius undergo the series of instructions prescribed by our diocesan statutes?; (d) Can Bertha be admitted to the Sacraments?

Case II. Some years ago and in the same district, Anna, a Catholic, married Caius, a non-Catholic. At the time, there was no priest available. Caius promised that, if Anna consented to be married by the Protestant Minister in a private home, they would remarry

when the priest came on his round. To this she consented, but, when the priest came, Caius refused to keep his promise. The first child was baptised by the Protestant Minister against Anna's will, but she was told she could have the next baptised a Catholic. When this arrived, Caius again broke his word. Anna now desires to go to the Sacraments. My main questions here are identical with those proposed under Case I, but, furthermore, I would ask:—

(a) Would it be prudent to make known to the people of these remote parts the provisions contained in Can. 1098?

(b) In the circumstances contemplated in this canon (1098), is marriage contracted before a civil Registrar valid? What about the case where the Protestant Minister acts as the civil Registrar, say, in a private home?

(c) In the absence of any other registered person, could a Catholic priest officiate at the marriage of two non-Catholics in his capacity as civil Registrar?

RUSTICUS.

REPLY.

The solution of these problems calls for a short preliminary commentary on Can. 1098 which, in so far as it concerns us here, rules as follows: "If the parish priest or the Ordinary, or a priest, delegated by either of these, cannot come to the parties nor can they, without serious inconvenience, go to him, and it is prudently foreseen that this state of things is going to last for a month, then the parties can contract validly and lawfully in the presence of only two witnesses (*coram solis testibus*)." It will be seen immediately that several conditions must be verified before the special concession granted by this canon can apply. The qualified priest must be so absent that (a) he cannot go to the parties, and (b) they cannot go to him without serious inconvenience, and (c) it is prudently foreseen that this state of things will last for a month.

The first condition is verified when the priest connot be summoned by the parties or when, summoned or not, he cannot make himself available to them. It is also verified when the absence of the priest is due to his own negligence, but in such a way that the parties cannot have the benefit of his ministry.

As the second condition indicates, it is not necessary that the absence of the priest be absolute and physical. It is sufficient that

those about to marry cannot approach him without serious inconvenience. As to what will constitute this serious inconvenience, it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule covering every case. The most one can do is to say that the parties are not bound to anything which is completely out of the ordinary, such as the incurring of expense which for them would be considerable, or the undertaking of a journey which is very laborious, either because of the distancce involved or the hazardous nature of the country, or to avail themselves of means of transport which, for the generality of people in their community, are still regarded as extraordinary or dangerous, e.gr., by aeroplane. We are dealing with *relative* inconvenience or impossibility, and, consequently, the solution of each case will depend on the circumstances surrounding it, circumstances which can be accurately estimated only by those on the spot. This, however, ought to be noted, namely, that *post factum,* a marriage ought not to be regarded as invalid even if there be some doubt as to the relative gravity of the inconvenience involved, provided, of course, a real inconvenience did exist, and it was not something imagined or feigned in order to evade the law. It must be remembered, too, that the commentators are agreed that a marriage before witnesses alone would be valid even if the parties deliberately waited till such time as a qualified priest would not be available for a month or even if they purposely betook themselves to a place where a priest would not be available.

The fact that no qualified priest is available at the moment is not in itself sufficient to permit the celebration of marriage before the witnesses alone. As a further condition, it is necessary that there be moral certainty that such absence will continue for a month. This implies that one's judgment be based on some fact or order of things which will permit him prudently to conclude that the priest will not be available within the limit mentioned. Such fact or order of things would be, for instance, if it were known that, in keeping with his established routine, the priest will not be due to visit the locality for five, six, or seven weeks yet as the case may be; or if he is on vacation and is not due to return till a certain date; or if he has been ill, and the doctor has declared that he will not be able to resume duty for a month yet. These, or similar facts, will provide sufficient ground whence one can prudently conclude that a priest will not be available within the specified time, and, in such circumstances, he could validly and lawfully contract marriage before two witnesses alone.

And this marriage would be valid even if, for some unforeseen reason, the priest became available within the month. On the other hand, a mere conjecture, not based on reasons sufficient to establish a prudent judgment, would not suffice to legitimize the exception, and a marriage contracted on the basis of such conjecture would have to be declared invalid even in the contingency that the priest, for some unexpected reason, actually was not available for more than a month. *Post factum,* therefore, the validity of a marriage contracted before two witnesses alone will have to be decided not so much on the length of time the priest was actually absent as on the justification the parties had for concluding that he would be absent for a month (See Reply of Pont. Commission, Nov. 10, 1925).

In offering an opinion on the two cases sent to us by our correspondent, we will have to presume a good deal which, though essential, he does not tell us. He mentions that, in both cases, the parties were married by a Protestant Minister. In our reply, we will presume that there was at least one other witness present. Moreover, we will presume that not only was a qualified priest not available at the time but, also, that the parties had good reason to believe that he would not be available within the month. We will have to presume, too, that the Catholic party really intended at the time to get married, as it might well happen that she regarded the Protestant function as a mere formality for the time being—intending to get married properly (i.e., to give real matrimonial consent) when the priest will be available. This is a matter that would have to be investigated. Now, assuming all the above, we could have no hesitation in saying that the legislation incorporated in Can. 1098 was applicable in the circumstances, and, consequently, a marriage contracted before two witnesses would be both valid and lawful. The cases proposed by our correspondent, however, involve some difficulties which, we believe, are the real reasons why he submitted them to us. First of all, there was question of marriages not between Catholics, but between persons bound by the impediment of Mixed Religion. Moreover, they were married not before two witnesses whatever, but before a Protestant Minister in his official capacity—something forbidden to Catholics by another canon of the Code (See Cans. 1063 § 1, 1258, 2319 § 1, n. 1). We shall deal with both of these difficulties.

As to the impediment of Mixed Religion, we must remark, first of all, that, in cases of urgency such as we are contemplating, this

impediment does not cease to bind after the manner that the obligation to the ordinary canonical form of marriage ceases. They are two different things altogether, and while the Church relaxes the obligation in the one case she does not do so in the other. Therefore, the parties acted in violation of this impediment, and sinned gravely in doing so. However, since Mixed Religion is not a diriment impediment, it would not render the marriage *invalid* in either case.

The other difficulty is more serious, as one might reasonably be inclined to think that when the Church allows Catholics, placed in extraordinary circumstances, to contract marriage in the presence of two witnesses alone, She has in mind two witnesses that are private persons and not Protestant Ministers or Civil Registrars acting in their official capacity. We say he might reasonably be inclined to think thus because the Protestant religious service involves the forbidden *communicatio in divinis cum haereticis* and is positively forbidden by law, while Catholics are allowed to approach the Civil Registrar *ad actum civilem dumtaxat explendum et effectuum civilium gratia* (Can. 1063 § 3). Strange though it may seem, this question seems to have escaped the notice of commentators generally. Not one of the recognised authors, as far as we are aware, has expressed an opinion one way or another as to whether a Protestant religious marriage or a purely civil marriage would come within the ambit of the concession embodied in Can. 1098. One writer, however, otherwise unknown to us, Professor Vinko Mocnik, did expressly raise the question is an issue of the Roman periodical *Apollinaris*.[1] He maintained that the expression, *coram solis testibus,* in the mind of the Church, means private persons only, and not official persons like the Civil Registrar or a non-Catholic Minister. Consequently according to this writer, a purely civil marriage or a Protestant religious marriage to which a Catholic is a party would not be valid under the concession granted in Can. 1098. He says this is the obvious meaning of the terms—*coram solis testibus*. Moreover, such interpretation is confirmed by the fact that par. 2 of Can. 1098 rules that if an unqualified priest be available, he ought to be invited to be present at the marriage. Now, no Catholic priest could assist at a purely civil or non-Catholic religious marriage. Therefore in par. 1, which incorporates the concession in question, the legislator cannot have had in mind purely civil or non-Catholic marriages. Thirdly, Can. 1098 contains an ex-

[1]Vide *Apollinaris* 1936, p. 304.

ception to the general law (Can. 1094) as to how marriages are to be contracted. Therefore, in keeping with the rule laid down in Can. 19, it must be strictly interpreted as meaning, namely, purely private persons to the exclusion of official persons like the civil Registrar or a Protestant Minister. Fourthly, the ordinary canonical form of marriage, as prescribed in Can. 1094, is this that marriage must be contracted before the parish priest and two witnesses. Can. 1098 contains an exception to this rule, but only in the sense that if the general rule cannot be observed in its entirety (i.e., in the presence of the parish priest), it be observed at least in the part that is possible, i.e.,, in the presence of the two witnesses who, evidently, are not either a civil Registrar or a non-Catholic Minister. Lastly, the concession granted in Can. 1098 must be interpreted in such a way that it will not conflict with other laws. Now, as we have seen, Catholics are forbidden to attempt marriage before a non-Catholic minister, and they are allowed to go through the formalities of a civil marriage only when this is necessary in order to have the civil effects of their marriage guaranteed. If, then, the Church were to acknowledge a purely civil or non-Catholic religious marriage as satisfying the requirements of Can. 1098, it would be contradicting its other legislation, which we cannot admit.

For all the above reasons, then, Professor Vinko Mocnik concluded that in Can. 1098 the legislator did not include the civil Registrar or non-Catholic Ministers in the phrase *coram solis testibus,* and, consequently, in the circumstances envisaged in this canon a purely civil marriage or a religious non-Catholic marriage would be invalid. Of course the Holy See is free to interpret the law in the other sense, but, should it do so, it would have to publish such interpretation officially (Can. 17 § 2), which thus far it has not done.

In a footnote to the above contribution, the editors of *Apollinaris* promised to give, later, a critique of Professor Vinko Mocnik's opinion. This critique, over the name of Virgilius Dalpiaz, appeared in their second issue of 1937, p. 275 & ff. This writer totally disagreed with the Professor. "His interpretation," he wrote, "cannot be admitted. It is true, indeed, that the Church introduced the present canonical form of marriage in the public interest; it is likewise true that the present legislation does everything to withdraw Catholics from attempting purely civil and non-Catholic marriages; it is true, too, that the witnesses (other than the priest) required by Can. 1094

are merely private persons. But from all this it does not follow that the witnesses of whom there is question in Can. 1098 must necessarily be private persons. . . . . Such interpretation would do violence to, and unduly restrict, the natural meaning of the words, *coram solis testibus,* of this law. The legislator wanted to provide for Catholics placed in such extraordinary circumstances that they could not contract marriage in the ordinary way. And he made this provision by ruling that they can validly contract before two witnesses alone. Who are those witnesses to be? Any persons capable of testifying to the fact that the parties manifested their mutual matrimonial consent to each other. . . . . The mind of the legislator, then, was that, in the absence of the qualified witness, the validity of the marriage of Catholics would be safeguarded by the presence of two witnesses, whoever they might be, so long as they be naturally capable of testifying to the fact of marriage. This is the evident meaning of the law, and it corresponds to the purpose the legislator had in view.

"This being so, it is hard to see how a civil Registrar or a non-Catholic Minister, and *a fortiori,* other persons present at a civil or non-Catholic marriage, would not be valid witnesses to a marriage contracted in the circumstances contemplated in Can. 1098. Are these persons not capable of testifying to the fact that the parties exchanged their mutual consent? . . . . Thus it was that, before the Code, in virtue of the concession granted in the Const. *Provida* of January 18, 1906, mixed marriages in Germany and Hungary were exempt from the ordinary law, and were valid even when contracted before a civil magistrate or a non-Catholic Minister. And, in these cases, the validity resulted not from the civil or religious ceremony but from the natural consent of the parties expressed before witnesses. So it is now under the provisions supplied by Can. 1098.

"This interpretation is confirmed by the decision given by the S. Cong. of the Sacraments to the Bishop of Pinsk on March 24, 1925. The question proposed concerned mixed marriages, and the S. Congregation replied that 'if all the conditions required by Can. 1098 for the validity of marriages before witnesses alone were verified, the fact that these marriages were blessed in a non-Catholic church would not prejudice their validity but only their liceity.'"

We entirely concur in this interpretation of Dalpiaz. The law makes no distinction on the point, and, consequently, *nec nos distinguere debemus.* As far as canon law is concerned, a civil Registrar and a

non-Catholic Minister are nothing more than private witnesses. Moreover, there is this further consideration as far as our conditions are concerned, namely, that unless these marriages are contracted before a civil Registrar or a non-Catholic Minister, they will not be valid in the eyes of the civil law, and the parties will not have the protection of this law either for themselves or for the legitimacy of their children. Surely that cannot be the mind of the legislator. Therefore, it is our humble opinion that, until the church declares otherwise, it is safe to hold that, in the peculiar circumstances contemplated in Can. 1098, a purely civil marriage or a religious non-Catholic marriage satisfies the conditions for validity in canon law. As to liceity, the civil marriage is quite in order, and so would be a marriage before a non-Catholic Minister in, say, a hotel without any religious function, as happened, it would seem, in the two cases outlined above by our correspondent. Catholics should always insist that there be no religious function at these marriages, but if, as might happen in the case of a mixed marriage, such insistence meant that the marriage would not take place, we think they would be justified in going through with the marriage provided they remain passive during the religious ceremony.

We are now in a position directly to answer the questions proposed by our correspondent. There are four questions common to Cases I and II, and there are three others proposed under Case II. As to the questions common to both, we would say:

(a) On the assumptions we laid down above, namely, (1) that, besides the Protestant Minister, there was at least one other witness present, (2) that, not only was the priest absent, but also the parties had good reason prudently to believe that he would not be available for a month, and (3) that Bertha and Anna really intended at the time to get married, on these assumptions, we say, we would have no doubt but that the marriage was valid in both cases.

(b) No censure was incurred. If there was no religious ceremony, the Catholic committed no fault whatever, especially in view of the requirements of our civil law, in getting married before the Protestant Minister. And, where there is no moral fault, there can be no question of penalty. If there were a religious ceremony, it is possible, as we pointed out above, that the Catholic, by remaining entirely passive during this ceremony, did not even then commit sin. But, even if we admit the worst, namely, that the Catholic took part in the religious ceremony, even then we maintain that she would not

incur the censure. Ordinarily, Catholics who, in violation of Can. 1063 § 1, get married before a non-Catholic minister, incur excommunication reserved to the Ordinary. But, since we are *in odiosis*, we must interpret this Canon 1063 in the very strictest sense, i.e., confine its ruling within the narrowest limits that its interpretation will reasonably bear. Now, anyone will admit that in Can. 1063 the legislator had in mind only those Catholics who, far removed from the peculiar circumstances visualized in Can. 1098, "before or after the Catholic marriage, approach a non-Catholic Minister to give or renew their matrimonial consent." The two cases are totally different, and, consequently the ruling of Can. 2228 applies, namely, that "a penalty attached to a law is not incurred unless the crime is complete in its kind according to the proper meaning of the law."

(c) Strictly speaking, the statute, requiring instruction of the non-Catholic before marriage, does not apply any longer. The parties are already married. At the most, there is a natural obligation on the priest to try and induce the man to submit to what should have been done previously, but if he refuses, what remedy is there?

(d) If Bertha and Anna are repentant, not indeed of getting married before the non-Catholic Minister as explained above, but of getting married in defiance of the impediment of Mixed Religion, they could be admitted to the sacraments.

As to the special questions proposed under Case II, this is our opinion:

(a) Speaking generally, we think that Catholics in those remote districts have a right to be instructed on the provisons the Church has made precisely for them. Given the rarity of the priest's visits, it can well happen that, for one of several reasons, Catholics may find themselves even in the necessity of getting married, and it is only right and just that they be aware of the fact that, if they prudently foresee that a qualified priest will not be available for a month, they can validly and lawfully marry before two witnesses. Why should they not be given this instruction? We know no reason—save perhaps the danger of abuse, which will have to be removed by instruction. Consequently, emphasis will have to be laid on the requisite conditions—(1) absence of qualified priest in the sense explained above; (2) reasons prudently to conclude that such priest will not be available within a month; (3) freedom from impediments. On this latter point, it will be very necessary to insist that, while persons are

not bound to wait longer than a month for the priest, still, if there be an impediment, e.gr., Mixed Religion, they cannot marry without a dispensation. If there were some more intelligent person in the locality who understands these things well, e.gr., a school teacher, it might be advisable, by instruction and arrangement, to authorize such person to be the friend and adviser of those contemplating marriage in the difficult circumstances we have under consideration.

(b) These questions have been sufficiently answered already.

(c) In the absence of any other civilly registered person, we do not think that a Catholic priest could officiate at the marriage of two non-Catholics merely in his capacity as civil Registrar. A Catholic priest cannot divest himself of his sacred character. When he officiates at a marriage, he does so actively, and not merely passively as other witnesses. It is hard to see then how he could avoid communicating *in sacris* with non-Catholics, no matter what his mental attitude be.

JOHN J. NEVIN.

Liturgy

I.—SUBSTITUTE FOR OLIVE OIL IN SANCTUARY LAMP.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Since the outbreak of war the price of olive oil has increased considerably, and at the present time it represents a large item on the local Altar Society's account. Moreover oil of olives is not procured so readily as formerly, and I have been reliably informed that it will become very scarce. In these circumstances is it permissible to substitute any other oil for use in the sanctuary lamp?

SUBSCRIBER.

REPLY.

It is within the province of the Local Ordinary to permit the use of substitute oils for the sanctuary lamp if olive oil is not procurable. He is directed, though, to choose some other vegetable oil if possible. It goes without saying that he may likewise permit the use of olive oil diluted by the addition of some substitute. Can. 1271 prescribes: Coram tabernaculo, in quo Sanctissimum Sacramentum asservatur, una saltem lampas diu noctuque continenter luceat, nutrienda oleo olivarum vel cera apum; ubi vero oleum olivarum haberi nequeat, Ordinarii loci prudentiae permittitur ut aliis oleis commutetur, quantum fieri potest, vegetalibus. (Cf. Rit. Rom., Tit. ix, Cap. 1, n. 6).

This discretionary power is granted to Local Ordinaries for the case in which olive oil is not obtainable—"ubi oleum olivarum haberi nequeat." It would seem then that he may authorise the use of substitutes both when olive oil is simply unprocurable and when its cost is so prohibitive as to make it morally unobtainable for some church or chapel. It is unlikely, though, that the increased cost—which, admittedly, is considerable—would make olive oil morally unprocurable for Australian churches or chapels. In the most extreme cases it would probably be sufficient to permit a dilution of the olive oil.

From ancient times oil of olives has been regarded as the proper oil for burning in the sanctuary lamp on account of the mystical significations assigned to it. However, various substitutes—even gas and electric light—have been permitted at the discretion of the Ordinary in cases of necessity. During the last war, at the request of several Ordinaries, the S. Congregation of Rites granted the following concession: "Inspectis circumstantiis enuntiatis, iisque perdurantibus,

remittendum prudentiae Ordinariorum ut lampas quae diu noctuque collucere debet coram Sanctissimo Sacramento, nutriatur, in defectu olei olivarum, aliis oleis, quantum fieri potest, vegetalibus aut cera apum pura vel mixta, et, ultimo loco, etiam luce electrica: si Sanctissimo placuerit." His Holiness Benedict XV subsequently ratified this decision of the Congregation. (Dec. Auth. 4334).

* * * *

II.—GENUFLECTIONS TO BE MADE DURING MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Will you kindly explain the following queries in the *A.C. Record*:

(1) A priest who is on his way to say Mass at a side altar passes near the high altar, at which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, and at which Mass is actually being celebrated. What genuflection is required? What bearing has it on the case that the celebrant at the high altar is between the Consecration and the Communion?

(2) What genuflection should be made by the faithful if they enter or leave the church between the Consecration and Communion of the Mass at the high altar? Similarly, what genuflection is correct if Mass at a side altar should be at this stage?

P.P.

REPLY.

The solution of the various cases enumerated is found in the Ritus celebrandi Missam of the Missal. Under the heading, "De Ingressu Sacerdotis," the following prescriptions are set out: "Procedit autem oculis demissis, incessu gravi, erecto corpore. Si vero contigerit eum transire ante altare majus, capite cooperto, faciat ad illud reverentiam. Si ante locum Sacramenti, geneflectat. Si ante locum ubi celebretur Missa in qua elevatur vel tunc ministratur Sacramentum, similiter genuflectat, et, detecto capite, illud adoret, nec ante surgat quam Celebrans deposuerit Calicem super corporale."

1. Accordingly, in the first case described by P.P., the priest should genuflect when passing the high altar insofar as the Blessed Sacrament is reserved there. He does not remove his biretta. The priest is said to pass "*near* the high altar." However, even though he does not actually pass in front of the tabernacle, it seems logical that he should genuflect, provided that he is passing within reasonable distance of it. The term "ante" may be interpreted in a somewhat broader sense to include such cases.

The procedure is not altered by the fact that Mass is in progress, unless the priest is passing during the Consecration or while Holy Communion is being distributed. In these cases he genuflects on both knees, and removes his biretta; should the Consecration be taking place he remains kneeling until the chalice is replaced on the corporal.

If he passes the altar between the Consecration and the Communion, therefore, he genuflects on one knee and does not remove his biretta. This is borne out by a response of the S. Congregation of Rites of 1904.

"I. Utrum Canonici, ante Altare in quo Missa celebratur transeuntes, a consecratione usque ad communionem, genuflexionem duplicem, nempe, utroque genu efficere debeant, an genu dextrum tantum usque in terram flectere?

II. Utrum idem modus genuflectendi servare etiam debeat a quolibet sacerdote, qui sive ad Altare procedit Missam celebraturus, sive redit celebrata Missa, transit ante aliud Altare in quo tunc Missa celebratur et est inter consecrationem et Communionem?

Ad I Negative at primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

Ad II Negative, nisi ultro, scilicet, nulla facta inquisitione, momentum advertatur, et serventur Rubricae "De Ritu celebrandi Massam, Tit. II, n. 1" (cited above).

The priest then is not obliged to find out for himself to what stage the Mass has advanced. If, however, he notices "ultro" that it is between the Consecration and Communion he genuflects on one knee; while, if he notices that it is actually the Consecration, or that Holy Communion is being distributed, he acts as already explained.

2. The same rules may be applied, servatis servandis, to the faithful who enter the church or leave between the Consecration and Communion. In regard to the Mass at the high altar they should genuflect on one knee, unless they are entering or departing during the Consecration or the distribution of Holy Communion, in which cases they should make a double genuflection. As to the Mass being celebrated at the side altar, they are not obliged to find out what stage the celebrant has reached. If, however, they advert to the fact that he is between the Consecration and Communion they should genuflect on one knee. If he is at the Consecration or is distributing Holy Communion, a double genuflection is required.

III.—DISTRIBUTING HOLY COMMUNION AT HIGH ALTAR DURING CONSECRATION AT SIDE ALTAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

While the celebrant at the high altar is distributing Holy Communion he becomes aware that a priest celebrating at a side altar, which is within the sanctuary, is at the Consecration. Should he interrupt the distribution of Holy Communion, and kneel until after the elevation of the Chalice?

REPLY.

The celebrant should continue to distribute Holy Communion irrespective of what is taking place at the side altar. The Ritus Servandus of the Missal gives a very explicit direction: "Et postquam id dixerit (i.e., In nomine Patris, etc.) non debet advertere quemcumque in alio altari celebrantem, etiamsi Sacramentum elevet, sed continuate prosequi Missam suam usque ad finem."

There can be no doubt that the distributing of Holy Communion should be considered as part of the Mass. Theological considerations establish this principle. It is accepted, too, in the rubrics of the Roman Ritual: "Intra Missam communio populi statim post communionem sacerdotis celebrantis fieri debet (nisi quandoque ex rationabili causa proxime ante vel statim post Missam privatam sit facienda), cum orationes quae in Missa post Communionem dicuntur, non solum ad sacerdotem, sed etiam ad alios communicantes spectent."

* * * *

IV.—ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF LITANY OF SACRED HEART.

Dear Rev. Sir

I have seen varying translations of the Litany of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. One has: "Heart of Jesus, in *Whom* the Father *was* well pleased," "Almighty and Eternal God, look upon the heart of Thy dearly beloved Son, and upon the praise and satisfaction *He* offers to Thee, etc." Another translation has: "Heart of Jesus, in *which* the Father *is* well pleased, and in the prayer "It" is used instead of "He." It seems to me that "which" and "It" are preferable; for thus we indicate that the Sacred Heart is worthy of all honour. Rendering "'complacuit" by "*was* well pleased" does not appear satisfactory. If we cannot say "*is* well pleased" let us use "*has been* well pleased."

On these points I should like to see some comment in the *A.C.R.*

RELIGIOSUS.

REPLY.

The Altar Manual, which was compiled by the committee appointed by the Fourth Plenary Council, and which is now in general use, contains an English translation of the Litany of the Sacred Heart. This translation must be considered as having an official status and its use is obligatory, at least in public recitation of the Litany. The invocation in question is rendered as, "Heart of Jesus in which the Father is well pleased." The translation of the prayer is as follows: "Almighty and Eternal God, look upon the Heart of Thy dearly beloved Son, and upon the praise and satisfaction which He rendered Thee in the name of sinners . . . ."

* * * *

V.—REPLACING CIBORIUM IN TABERNACLE WHILE MASS IS IN PROGRESS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

After saying Mass in the convent chapel, the priest frequently takes Holy Communion to sick Sisters, who reside in the convent. It sometimes happens that when he returns to the altar to replace the ciborium in the tabernacle, another priest has already begun to say Mass. In such a case, should he recite the prayers and give the blessing as directed by the Roman Ritual? If so, what should the celebrant of the Mass do while the prayers are being said?

REPLY.

The case, it seems, is not directly envisaged by the rubrics. In fact, the situation should not occur at all; the second celebrant should await the return of his colleague before commencing Mass. If, however, the situation unavoidably occurs, a guiding principle in determining the correct procedure could be that the Mass should not be interrupted by rites and prayers which are not contemplated by the rubrics. Following out this principle, the priest who has distributed Holy Communion should replace the ciborium in the tabernacle with the customary genuflections, omitting the prayers and blessing prescribed in the Ritual. Meanwhile the celebrant should also genuflect towards the tabernacle. It could be arranged that these genuflections should be made at the end of the epistle or gospel or some such unified part of the Mass, in order to make the interruption less obvious.

VI.—SERMON DURING EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

On a recent National Day of Prayer exposition of the Blessed Sacrament was held in the parish church. A sermon was preached immediately before the deposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The subject of the discourse was at least remotely suggested by the occasion, as Christian ideals of social justice and peace amongst men were expounded.

Is this procedure contrary to the rubrics? If not, should the monstrance be veiled while the sermon is being delivered?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

Some rubricists deprecate entirely the practice of preaching during Exposition. It is argued that the Blessed Sacrament is exposed so that the faithful may engage in prayer and adoration. The preaching of a sermon is said to hinder the achieving of this objective.

This line of reasoning receives some authoritative support from the Clementine Instruction, which regulates the Forty Hours Adoration in Rome. In this document the following prescription is contained: "During the Forty Hours it is strictly forbidden to preach; but, if it is desired to give a short address after Vespers to rouse the devotion of the faithful towards the Blessed Sacrament, leave and blessing must be obtained from Us or Our Vicar, and that not only for the Forty Hours, but also for any other Exposition." It is by way of a concession, then, that a short address to arouse the fervour of the faithful—a fervorino, as it is often called—may be permitted. However, the Clementine Instruction has only a local binding force.

There is no general law forbidding sermons during Exposition. On the contrary, explicit provision is made for preaching in a reply of the Congregation of Rites:

"Num tolerari potest consuetudo exponendi SS. Sacramentum et coram Eo Missam celebrandi (occasione Novendialis) in qua fit post Evangelium praedicatio Verbi Dei et plerumque de Sanctis; et in qua populus frequens accedit ad Sacram Synaxim?

Affirmative; apposito tamen velamine ante SS. Eucharistiam dum habetur concio" (Dec. Auth. 3728).

The questions submitted by Parochus may now be answered in the light of these considerations.

(1) It cannot be said that the preaching was contrary to the rubrics; for, as has been pointed out, provision is made for it in the Reply cited above. As to the line of reasoning advanced by certain rubricists, it must be admitted that the argument has much to commend it. Perhaps, though it warrants a condemnation of too lengthy or too frequent sermons during Exposition, rather than an unqualified deprecating of all such discourses. In such a matter local conditions and customs merit consideration. The concourse of people assembled for Sunday evening devotions, the relatively few opportunities available to instruct the people, the special purpose of the day of prayer are considerations which outweigh the argument advanced.

(2) As directed in the reply of the S.C.R., a banner should be placed before the Blessed Sacrament during the sermon.

Correspondence

Wynberg,
Brisbane,
7/1/42.

Dear Father,

I read with considerable interest Fr. Ryan's article in the July "Record" advocating a scheme of superannuation for priests. I was astonished, however, to see that it provoked so little comment; surely a subject of such importance to us all must have aroused interest in the presbyteries of the Commonwealth? Our younger colleagues, who are still full of the joy of living, may be pardoned for paying little heed to a scheme dealing with what must seem to them the far distant future, but few of the senior clergy can be indifferent to any proposal for establishing the financial security of their later years.

There can be no doubt that Fr. Ryan's suggestion must meet with approval everywhere; but what we want now is for those who approve to bestir themselves and find some means for putting it into practice. Too often have excellent ideas been allowed to drop merely because everyone waited for someone else to make a move. I suggest, therefore, that the interested priests of each diocese should meet together and discuss the practicability of the scheme. I am assured by laymen who participate in similar schemes that the details as set forth in Fr. Ryan's article are sound, but of course each diocese could and would alter details to fit in with local conditions. Fr. Hunter's suggestion of beginning with endowment would probably be found satisfactory in most cases. It would only call for a subscription of 5/- each week, and surely there is no priest who could not afford that sum, when it was to return to him as provision for his old age.

Let me in conclusion mention that the point which Fr. Ryan says should be insisted on, no matter what variations are introduced in different dioceses, namely, that the fund should be provided from subscriptions by the priests rather than appeals to the parishes, seems to me to be one of the attractions of his scheme; I feel convinced that the

assurance that superannuation does not mean another series of appeals to the parish, woul do much, if more than its own obvious value were needed, to make many harassed priests feel favourably towards it. Hoping to see some discussion of this matter in the columns of the "Record,"

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
J. TAMULIS, D.P.H. (Louv.),
Archbishop's House,
"Wynberg,"
Brisbane.

Book Reviews

THE BOND OF PERFECTION, by Sister Mary Agnes, S.N.D.

Into the midst of men, divided by a world war, comes this book, bearing in its pages the seed of world unity—Christ's teaching on Charity. It is Christ's teaching, though Saint Paul's letters are the source, for we know "cor Pauli, cor Christi," Paul's mind is the mind of Christ. And it bears the seed of world unity, for "until the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God becomes understood practically by men, there will be little hope of bettering the social and moral decadence deplored so fruitlessly to-day" (p. 132). Men deplore present chaotic conditions, nationalism gone mad. They speak of new world-orders. But they do so "fruitlessly." It is only by planting the seed of goodwill towards God and man that we can do anything that will effectively help towards a reunion of the human family. We must first plant that seed in our own gardens, and when it grows there, it will spread easily and naturally elsewhere. The development of Saint Paul's thoughts on Charity in the "Bond of Perfection" will help towards such an attempt.

Charity, we read in the first meditation, is the "bond of perfection," the virtue that "not merely leads us to God, but actually binds us with Him." Saint Paul's words are at the head of the second meditation—"About brotherly love there is no need to write to you, for yourselves are taught of God." Yet the next hundred pages deal directly with brotherly love. We are not to disdain such explanation, though we must "rely primarily on God's prompting grace." But what is charity? Love of God, we are told, is an "intellectual conviction of God's Infinite love for us." The phrase "intellectual conviction' is a rather unhappy one, and later charity is more accurately defined as a "divinely infused habit which inclines the will to cherish God above all things for His own sake and man for the sake of God"—"a theological virtue resident in the will." It, of course, presupposes an intellectual conviction of God's goodness, and in a meditation on "Pardoning one another," the author, in a more satisfying and complete analysis of the virtue of charity, makes her meaning clear. Then, touching the important question of the relation between feelings and charity, she goes on to show that it is not the mere "feeling" that counts, but the deliberate and wilful nurturing of that feeling, for love "is to be found on the

level of the will." Men have likes and dislikes. Only when these are adopted by the will do they become virtuous or sinful. Just as the mere liking for a fellowman is not charity, neither is the bare feeling of hatred against another sin. But charity is born at the moment the will, motivated by an appreciation of God's Goodness, adopts this liking, and sin springs up, once the will against God's command indulges in the feeling of hatred. A few words in the earlier part of the book, clarifying the precise meaning of charity, would have done away with a certain amount of vagueness, especially in the earlier meditations.

Amongst the latter meditations, "The Whole of the Law," "Forbearance," "Christ and Charity" are outstanding, while "Justice and Charity" treats, perhaps a little too hastily, the very delicate question of the relation of these two virtues.

While these criticisms may be true, yet these meditations will bring a lasting blessing on those who think over them, will help them to appreciate the heart of Saint Paul and—immeasurably greater benefit—will help them to appreciate Christ our Lord, in whose Sacred Heart is the only hope of our war-ridden world.

JAMES DYNON, S.J., Pymble.

* * * *

THE THINGS THAT MATTER. By Rev. A. Roche; pp. 207. Longmans, Green and Co.

This series of essays by a priest in England deals with a subject which is as old as the Church, yet which demands a new treatment for every generation. A programme of Christian life in its fullness—such is Fr. Roche's theme. He proves with freshness of treatment the age-old claim that in our dispensation the only complete and balanced life is the Christian life, and that nothing truly human falls outside the sphere of that life. History, literature and art are drawn upon to illustrate and enrich the proof. But what gives the book most interest and value for us is the fact that it is not the abstract Christian life that is discussed, but Christian life as it must be led in this part of the twentieth century. How to avoid hindrances to fullness of life today, and above all, how to make the traditional Christian way of living work not only with, but in and through the institutions of our time—

all this is treated with broad-minded wisdom and sympathy that is refreshing to find in these days of one-sided propaganda.

Fr. Roche's approach to life is indeed far from being one-sided. He looks all round a subject, and has a word to say on matters as homely as diet and youth's desire for "striped ties and spotted socks," and as sublime as man's eternal hunger for the divine. He does not try to convince you that the Christian life is easy, or that any simple formula will solve all problems. Nor will he connect the true Christian life necessarily with any particular social or industrial background. If you go about it rightly, he shows, you can live the more abundant life in city or country, in lay life or in the convent, in catacomb or air-raid shelter. Such a reminder is useful to-day, when so many tend to hold that only with this or that social structure is there hope for Christianity.

These essays are neither propaganda in the popular sense nor literary essays. They have neither the narrow singleness of outlook of the one nor the self-conscious style of the other. Their style is interesting and curiously diverse, changing in consecutive sentences from academic or journalistic to popular, thus giving the impression of outspoken talks rather than of finished literary productions.

With something interesting or challenging on every page, the book will prove useful for any reading Catholic, and especially useful for the Catholic who suffers from the delusion that his faith is a matter of "Don'ts," or an obstacle to a full human life, or merely a burden, or at most a Sunday interest, whose influence should not survive the coming of Monday.

F. O'B.

* * * *

NOBLE CASTLE. By Christopher Hollis. Pp. 216. Price 8/6. Longmans, Green and Co.

The title of this book is not enlightening to the prospective reader. The book covers a section of Christian apologetics, and the goal reached by a journey through its pages is the Christian Faith. But it is reached by a somewhat unusual way—that of the yearnings and conscious or unconscious insufficiencies in the thought and lives of Greeks and Jews and Romans before the coming of Christ: the Christian Faith is shown as the contenting of all these.

Throughout the book one catches echoes of such thinkers as Christopher Dawson and G. K. Chesterton, and it may be that there is not much in the book that is quite original. Yet even if this supposition be true, Mr. Hollis has made the thought his own; and all praise to him for not trying to increase his reputation, as some do, by originality at all costs—even at the cost of truth.

There have been many books of late years giving the trains of thought or experience that have brought particular people to the Church. It is not to be supposed that this book is such a record of personal experience. Rather it is written to show lovers of the ancient literatures how the works they love all point forward to the Christian Faith. And it may be added that those who have the task of trying to inspire young Australians with some appreciation of these works will get considerable help from the chapters on the Greek and Latin literatures.

The book will have a special interest for those who have made a formal study of fundamental theology. For it puts a part of fundamental theology into more or less popular form. It could therefore act as a sort of refresher course with two special characteristics: the first, that it often gives striking expression to the ordinary stock-in-trade of the apologist; and the second, that it sometimes rouses the antagonism of the careful reader.

This second characteristic is to be found above all in the first chapter, which is perhaps the least fortunate in the book. It would be too long to give a detailed criticism of it. And to do so would give a false idea of the book. For this first chapter is short enough, and as for the rest of the book, though a sentence here and there makes one hesitate, it is on the whole admirable. One chapter indeed is of such excellence that one feels it could scarcely be too much praised. It is the chapter entitled "Where was the Body?"—from the point of view of ordinary apologetics, the second most important in the book. Here we have the usual arguments for the Resurrection of our Lord put with a clearness and force that it would be difficult to equal. Opponent after opponent is given freedom of attack, and every one of them is convincingly vanquished. If I were to pick out anything as pre-eminent in a pre-eminent chapter, it would be the last three pages, in which St. Paul is first adduced by opponents as a destroyer of the Christian claims, and is then triumphantly revealed by Mr. Hollis as the witness of witnesses.

The book as a whole will be of most interest to those who are still on speaking terms with the old pagan classics, but those who have turned their backs on them since they left the student's desk may get some pleasure out of meeting them again in a perhaps unfamiliar guise. And they need not fear their lack of practice in the languages; there is no Greek in the book, and all the Latin quotations are translated in footnotes.

EDWARD GRYST, S.J.

* * * *

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Seeking for Trouble, by Margaret Monro. Longmans. 5/- net.

Progress in Divine Union, by Raoul Plus, S.J. F. Pustet Co. Inc.

Her Silence Speaks, by Father Middleton. P. J. Kennedy & Sons.

A Light to My Paths, by Peter Lippert, S.J. F. Pustet & Co. Inc.

Father John Sullivan, S.J., by Fergal McGrath, S.J. Longmans.

The Altar Server, by Rev. Bernard O'Connor. Pellegrini & Co.